



July 12, 2002

Ms. Elaine S. Hengen  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of El Paso  
2 Civic Center Plaza  
El Paso, Texas 79901-1196

OR2002-3785

Dear Ms. Hengen:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 166431.

The City of El Paso Police Department (the "department") received a request for Case No. 01-360022 and Internal Affairs Investigation No. IA02-005. You state that a portion of the requested information was the subject of a previous ruling from this office. In Open Records Letter No. 2002-0499 (2002), we concluded that, with the exception of basic information, the department could withhold the requested information pertaining to Case No. 01-360022 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. Therefore, as you represent that the four criteria for a "previous determination" established by this office in Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) have been met, the department may continue to withhold the information previously submitted in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2002-0499 (2002).<sup>1</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.301(f); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). You further

---

<sup>1</sup>The four criteria for this type of "previous determination" are 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code; 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the attorney general's prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior attorney general ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling. See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

state that the department has previously provided the requestor with the entirety of the information that was ordered released in Open Records Letter No. 2002-0499 (2002), and that the requestor has been notified of this fact pursuant to section 552.232 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.232 (governmental body shall certify to requestor that copies of all or part of requested information, as applicable, were previously furnished to requestor). Thus, we need not address those request items in this ruling. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301.

You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

The department has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The department must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated that a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the

governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (the "TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code. You state that the department received a notice of claim letter that meets the requirements of the TTCA on March 13, 2002. You have provided this office with a copy of the letter. The claims raised in the letter relate to the same incident that is the subject of the current request for information. Therefore, we find that you have established that litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date of your receipt of the request for information. We further conclude that you have made the requisite showing that the requested information relates to that anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Thus, you may withhold the remaining requested information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, with the exception of basic information that has already been released to the requestor, the department may withhold the submitted information in Case No. 01-360022 in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2002-0499 (2002). The remaining submitted information may be withheld from public disclosure under section 552.103.<sup>2</sup>

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

---

<sup>2</sup>As the previous determination and section 552.103 are dispositive, we do not address your other arguments.

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 166431

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. James W. Terrel  
325 Belvidere Street  
El Paso, Texas 79912  
(w/o enclosures)